

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims have not been amended. Claims 1-43 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-39, and 41-43

In the Office Action at page 2, numbered item 3, claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-39 and 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,141 to Straub et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,959,621 to Nawaz et al. and further in view of newly cited U.S. Patent No. 6,418,214 to Smythe et al. Of the rejected claims, claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 30, and 37 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an object display device and recites "a converter means for converting a representative character string of source data containing character strings into image data defined as an object", "a storage means for storing the source data and the image data in a manner of relating these pieces of data to each other", and "a display means for displaying the image data on a moving display area of the display means" wherein "a user selects the image data from the moving display areas and the display means displays the selected image data on a user selected stationary display area separate from the moving display area" and "when the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area is designated, the display means displays the source data linked to the selected image data on a display separate from the moving display area" and "the user selected stationary display area of the display means and the image data on the moving display area, the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed." Independent claims 12 and 19 recite similar features.

Independent claim 23 is also directed to an object display device. Independent claim 23 recites "a display means for displaying plural pieces of information in a manner of sequentially changing a display content on a moving display area of the display means", "a detection means for detecting a predetermined user's operation for the information displayed", and "a record means for recording the information operated in accordance with the detection of the users' operation", wherein "a user selects image data from the moving display area and a stationary display area separate from the moving display area and the display means displays

the selected image data on the stationary display area separate from the moving display area", and "when the selected image data on the stationary display area separate from the moving display area is designated, the display means displays source data linked to the selected image data on a display area separate from the moving display area and the user selected stationary display area", and "the image data on the moving display area, the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed". Independent claims 30 and 37 recite similar features.

At pages 3 and 8-9, the Office Action acknowledges that Straub et al. and Nawaz et al. fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and 23, respectively. More specifically, the Office Action acknowledges that Straub et al. and Nawaz et al. fail to teach or suggest that "when the selected image data on the stationary display area separate from the moving display area is designated, the display means source data linked to the selected image data on a display area separate from the moving display area and the user selected stationary display area, and the image data on the moving display area, the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed." Independent claims 12, 19, 30, and 37 recite similar features. The Office Action contends that newly cited Smythe et al. cures the deficiencies of Straub et al. and Nawaz et al. by teaching "opening a new window when a link is selected." The Office Action cites Smythe et al. at col. 11, lines 55-68 in support of this contention. Applicants, however, respectfully disagree with this assertion.

Smythe et al. is directed to a network-based conference system. The cited portion of Smythe et al. relates to "Sharing URLs" and states

When users are connected together in a conference they can share a URL with each other. This may be useful for instance when a person wants others who they are talking with to see the same WWW page that they are looking at. To share a URL, a user either manually types or copies and pastes the relevant text string into an HTML generated text box in the control frame 320 of the meeting-place 300. The user then either presses the 'return' button or activates a 'share URL' button. This causes the URL to be associated with the user for the rest of the conference by storing this URL in the PERSON table for that user. This is indicated visually in the meeting place window 300 of all conference participants by showing a small graphic with the word 'link' beneath the image 330 of the sending user.

Smythe et al. at col. 11, line 55 to col. 12, line 1. Thus, according to Smythe et al. a small graphic with the word "link" is shown beneath the image associated with the user sending the link. Further, Smythe et al. states "Others in the conference can click on a link graphic to see the associated URL opened up in a new window on their browser." Smythe et al. at col. 12, lines 9-

11. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Smythe et al. teaches only that, if a participant in a conference clicks on a link while participating in a conference, that URL associated with that link will be displayed in a new, separate browser window. Smythe et al. provides no teaching or suggesting that "source data linked to the selected image data" is displayed, or that this source data is displayed simultaneously with image data on the moving display area, and the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area.

Applicants respectfully submit that Smythe et al. fails to teach or suggest that, when the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area is designated, "source data linked to the selected image data" is displayed "on a display area separate from the moving display area and the user selected stationary display area" and that "the image data on the moving display area, the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data" are simultaneously displayed. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Smythe et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Straub et al. and Nawaz et al. acknowledged by the Office Action and noted above.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Straub et al., Nawaz et al., and Smythe et al., whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 30, and 37. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 30, and 37, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Claims 26, 33, and 40

In the Office Action at page 12, numbered item 4, dependent claims 26, 33, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,141 to Straub et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,959,621 to Nawaz et al. in view of newly cited U.S. Patent No. 6,418,214 to Smythe et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,586 to Kisiel. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Kisiel is directed to a system, method and computer program product for automating the collection, management and analysis of heterogeneous data. Kisiel is relied upon to teach only "an object wherein the operation is a drag-and-drop operation aiming at a desired piece of information." Applicants respectfully submit that Kisiel fails to remedy the deficiencies of Straub et al., Nawaz et al., and Smythe et al. noted above with respect to independent claims 23, 30, and 37, from which claims 26, 33, and 40 depend. Thus, Straub et al., Nawaz et al., Smythe et al., and Kisiel, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of dependent claims 26, 33, and 40.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 26, 33, and 40 patentably distinguish over the prior art for at least those reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 23, 30, and 37, from which they depend and, therefore, dependent claims 26, 33, and 40, are in condition for allowance.

Request for Examiner Interview

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative to schedule an Interview before issuance of the next Office Action.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3 April 2006

By: Allison Olenginski
Allison Olenginski
Registration No. 55,509

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501